3/9/69

Dear Dick,

What it was that impelled you to get the Overstreet book I do not know, but if you expected any kind of an honest appraisal - any kind of honesty at all- you have thrown your money away. For any such purpose you will also throw away the time you spend reading it. I have never read a book so entirely dishonest, beginning with concept. Toward the end I merely skimmed, reading parts carefully, hastening through others. I ended with the conclusion that this book was designed as a partial answer to Hoover's conspicuous dishonesties and failures in the assassination investigations.

Why they have this servile attitude toward such a man I cannot say, unless it is the red phobia that so obviously dominates their every thought. They cannot speak of the klan, for example, except by bracketting with the Communists. Their servility is abundant in the smallest ways. While the great and important are referred to, after first mention, without "Mr." almost without exception he is "Mr. Hoover".

There is one "factual" answer to every charge: Hoover's word. He is right simply because he says he is right. No other autority is needed or cited. Except at the very end, when his charging about 70 percent more people with disloyalty than the appeals boards would sustain is the closing deification, their absolute proof of their faith in his unerring good judgement.

This is perhaps the most incredible trash I have ever read, certainly of serious, pretendedly scholarly works. Having read it, I wonder if there is a single thing in it that can betrusted. In many cases, deppite their smoothness, their selectivity in quotation and reference is without need of proving, it is that obvious. They are devotees of the non sequitur.

Unlike Jesus, whomwas mortal and erred in trusting Judas, this is the man without a single error. He has made none, can make none.

It is so openly argumentative, it will be credited by only those beginning with no other intent or capability. If Hoover can be embarrassed, this book will do it.

Only because it seems impossible that they can be completely wrong have I interest in a single part. The conclusion I draw is that their major single source was Hoover and hile filas. I think he had it all done and when they wanted it, delivered it. However, because of Bill Turner's undeviating very bad influence on Garrison, I have interest in him. So, if copying that chapter presents no great difficulty for you, and no cost, when you can I'd like that to have on hand in case there ever develops need to check it out. Most of Garrison's errors originate with Turner, much of him enormous waste of time and money. I know of nothing, not a single good thing, for which he was responsible.

I will now return the book, insured. What an experience!

Sincerely,

COPY